



IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

REC'D
AUG 3 2001
TC 1700
AUG 29 2001

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

August 29, 2001

Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application.

- The fee has been calculated as shown below:

	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT		HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR		PRESENT EXTRA	RATE	ADDITIONAL FEE
TOTAL	16	-	20	=	0	\$18	\$0.00
INDEPENDENT	3	-	3	=	0	\$80	\$0.00
<input type="checkbox"/> FIRST PRESENTATION OF A MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM						\$270	\$0.00
						TOTAL	\$0.00

- ☐ Petition for () month(s) extension of time pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a). \$0.00 for the extension of time.
- ☒ No fee is required.
- ☐ A check in the amount of \$0.00 is enclosed.
- ☐ Please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2448 in the amount of \$0.00. This form is submitted in triplicate.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Andrew D. Meikle, #32,868

ADM/KJK/jao
2185-0382P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

ATTACHMENT

(Rev. 01/22/01)



PATENT
2185-0382P

#6
8/31/01
R

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Akihiro ICHIGE et al. Conf.: 5804
Appl. No.: 09/442,416 Group: 1773
Filed: December 1, 1999 Examiner: D. Nakarani
For: MULTILAYER FILM

RECEIVED
AUG 3 2001
TC 1700

AMENDMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, DC 20231

August 29, 2001

Sir:

In reply to the Examiner's Office Action dated May 29, 2001, the following amendments and remarks are respectfully submitted in connection with the above-identified application.

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. No claims have been canceled or added.

Examiner's Rejection

The Examiner rejects claims 1-16 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as not enabling. Specifically, the Examiner does not find support in the specification to sufficiently teach one of ordinary skill in the art how to achieve tear strength in the machine direction that is greater than the tear strength in the transverse direction. The Examiner notes, for example, Table 1,